

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JOHN REDMAN,

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

D.K. JENNINGS, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:12-cv-01516-APG-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 48)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for discovery. Docket No. 48. Defendants filed a response. Docket No. 51. No reply has been filed. Plaintiff's motion appears to be a discovery request. The court informs Plaintiff that discovery requests should be served on opposing counsel and should not be filed with the Court. *See* Local Rule 26-8. In its response, Defendants have agreed to produce documents responsive to four of the five requests at issue. *See* Docket No. 51 at 1-2. As to the final request, Defendants have asked Plaintiff to properly propound it through a formal discovery request for the purpose of Defendants lodging objections. *See id.* at 2.

Hence, at present there does not appear to be a discovery dispute ripe for judicial intervention. Pursuant to their representations, the Court orders Defendants to produce responsive documents as outlined in their brief (to the extent they have not done so already). *See* Docket No. 51 at 1-2. With respect to the final request for production, the Court orders Plaintiff to serve it on Defendants as a proper discovery request. In the event that a discovery dispute arises, the Court reminds the parties that they are required to attempt to resolve the dispute amongst themselves before seeking Court intervention. *See, e.g.*, Local Rule

1 26-7(b). Only once that has been done may they file a motion seeking relief from the Court.

2 In light of the above, the pending motion for discovery is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: January 5, 2015

5 
6 NANCY J. KOPPE
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE